REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 7 and 10-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 2, 3 and 7 are amended and claims 10-15 are added. Support for new claims 10, 12 and 14 can be found in the specification, for example Fig. 5 and page 11, lines 10-20. Support for new claims 11 and 13 can be found in the specification, for example Fig. 3 and page 9, lines 11-23. Support for new claim 15 can be found in the specification, for example page 9, lines 18-23 and page 14, lines 3-10.

Claims 2, 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The rejection is traversed.

With respect to independent claim 2, the Examiner expressed confusion as towards how address information is obtained from the list. The phrase in question reads "a selection unit that enables the user to designate the one node to be set with address information from the list." Claim 2 is not attempting to obtain address information from the list but is allowing the user to designate a node from the list in order to set address information.

In claims 2, 3 and 7 the Examiner asserted that "one node" and "the one node" are indefinite because it is not clear whether those terms are referring to a node from the "nodes of network." References to "node" or "the one node" in the singular refers to the "one node to be set with address information" as designated by the first reference to a singular node in the claim language. The Examiner also asserts that "nodes" lacks proper antecedent basis however Applicants disagree. The first recitation of "nodes" appears in the second line of each independent claim and is not preceded by "said" or "the" which would indicate a preceded reference. Similarly, all further recitations of "nodes" in the plural refer to the first instance appearing in the second line of the independent claims, with the exception of the last reference in the claims to "nodes that transmitted responses" which clearly defines itself from the others.

We respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Roy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,859) in view of Bruck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,949). The rejection is traversed.

Roy and Bruck fail to teach an IP address setting system comprising a plurality of nodes of a network, **each node providing notification that the node is a member of a particular multicast address**, as recited in claims 2, 3 and similarly recited in claim 7. Furthermore, Roy and Bruck fail to teach an IP address setting device, comprising a request packet transmitting unit that transmits a request packet to **a particular multicast address** as recited in claims 2, 3 and similarly recited in claim 7.

In the response to arguments, the Examiner asserts that Roy teaches the equivalent of transmitting to **a particular multicast address** because Roy teaches "SNMP Request can be sent to specific devices on a sub-network, such as that of a specified class, for example a certain brand of printers. Therefore the request is not sent to all devices, but only some." Applicants do not agree with this analysis.

As is understood by one skilled in the art, a multicast differs from a broadcast in that rather than being received by all nodes listening in on a network, a multicast is received only by those nodes listening to a **particular multicast address**. Roy teaches a device discovery task that broadcasts an SNMP over UDP based request out on a sub-network for devices to respond (col. 4, line 35). The broadcast is transmitted to all nodes in the network which then respond with network address, name, status, version and model (col. 2, line 37). Any responses received from devices outside a specified class of devices, such as those not of a certain brand, are then disregarded (col. 2, line 40). Roy utilizes a broadcast message instead of a multicast message to all network nodes (col. 3, lines 60-67) and thereafter filters out the responses from nodes which are not applicable. Therefore, Roy teaches broadcasting a

request to all network nodes and therefore does not teach transmitting a request packet to a particular multicast address, as is recited in independent claims 2, 3 and 7.

The Examiner appears to confuse broadcasting over a sub-network as being the equivalent to multicasting to a particular multicast address. Broadcasting to a sub-network differs from multicasting in that all nodes on the sub-network will receive the broadcast whereas a multicast is targeted only to particular nodes of interest. Therefore, Roy nor Bruck teach a request packet transmitting unit that transmits a request packet to a particular multicast address, as is recited in independent claims 2, 3 and 7, and therefore do not support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Furthermore, Roy is exclusively directed to a method of broadcasting to network nodes and doesn't teach multicasting. Broadcasting to a sub-network, as taught by Roy, would not necessarily reach all network nodes as a router located in a sub-network would filter the broadcast message from reaching the nodes located off of it (for example, see specification, "Summary of the Invention" paragraphs 1-3). Only by multicasting to a specific network address can a network administrator ensure that all applicable nodes receive a message and respond.

As described in detail above, neither Roy nor Bruck teach multicasting and therefore do not teach a plurality of nodes of a network, each node providing notification that the node is a member of a particular multicast address, as recited in claims 2 and 3 and similarly recited in claim 7.

We respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to new claims 10-15, Roy and Bruck fail to teach the deficiencies as described above with respect to claims 2, 3 and 7, as well as the further limitations recited therein.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:JAR/tbm

Date: January 22, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461